

$P \neq NP$ for infinite time Turing machines

Ralf Schindler^{a*}

^a*Institut für formale Logik, Universität Wien, 1090 Wien, Austria*

rds@logic.univie.ac.at
http://www.logic.univie.ac.at/~rds/

Abstract. We state a version of the “ $P = ?NP$ ” problem for infinite time Turing machines. It is observed that $P \neq NP$ for this version.

Infinite time Turing machines were introduced in [1]. The purpose of this note is to point out that $P \neq NP$ for a transfinite version of the “ $P = ?NP$ ” problem.

A “real” is considered an element of 2^ω , i.e., an infinite sequence of 0’s and 1’s. We’ll write $\mathbb{R}$ for 2^ω . It will be convenient to think of a Turing machine to come with *two* halting states, the accept state, and the reject state.

Definition 0.1 *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}$. We say that A is decidable in polynomial time, or $A \in P$, if there are a Turing machine T and some $m < \omega$ such that*
(a) T decides A (i.e., $x \in A$ iff T accepts x), and
(b) T halts on all inputs after $< \omega^m$ many steps.

With infinite time Turing machines, all inputs (i.e., reals) should be counted as having the same length, namely ω . So it appears reasonable to have a polynomial time Turing machine to be one which always halts after $< \omega^m$ many steps, for some fixed $m < \omega$.

Definition 0.2 *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}$, and let $\alpha \leq \omega_1 + 1$. We say that A is in P_α if there are a Turing machine T and some $\beta < \alpha$ such that*
(a) T decides A (i.e., $x \in A$ iff T accepts x), and
(b) T halts on all inputs after $< \beta$ many steps.

Of course, $P = P_{\omega^\omega}$. Moreover, P_{ω_1+1} is just the class of all $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ which are decided by some Turing machine. Also:

^{*}2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 68Q15, 68Q17, 03E15.
 Keywords: computer science/complexity theory/descriptive set theory.

Lemma 0.3 ([1], Theorem 2.6) *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}$. Then $A \in P_{\omega^2}$ if and only if “ $x \in A$ ” is an arithmetic statement, uniformly in x (i.e., if A is in Σ_ω^0).*

Lemma 0.4 *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}$. Then $A \in P_{\omega_1^{CK}}$ if and only if A is a hyperarithmetic set, and if $A \in P_{\omega_1}$ then A is a Borel set.*

PROOF. The first part is [1] Theorem 2.7, and the second part is an immediate consequence of the proof thereof. $\square$

We now turn to the class NP .

Definition 0.5 *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}$. We say that A is verifiable in polynomial time, or $A \in NP$, if there are a Turing machine T and some $m < \omega$ such that*
(a) $x \in A$ if and only if $(\exists y \ T \text{ accepts } x \oplus y)$, and
(b) T halts on all inputs after $< \omega^m$ many steps.

Definition 0.6 *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}$, and let $\alpha \leq \omega_1 + 1$. We say that A is in NP_α , if there are a Turing machine T and some $\beta < \alpha$ such that*
(a) $x \in A$ if and only if $(\exists y \ T \text{ accepts } x \oplus y)$, and
(b) T halts on all inputs after $< \beta$ many steps.

Again, $NP = NP_{\omega^\omega}$. NP_α is the class of all projections of sets in P_α . Hence every set in NP_{ω_1+1} is analytic.

It is now immediate that $P \neq NP$.

Theorem 0.7 $NP_{\omega+1} \setminus P_{\omega_1} \neq \emptyset$.

PROOF. Let A be an appropriate universal Σ_1^1 set. There is then a recursive R such that

$$x \in A \Leftrightarrow \exists y \in \mathbb{R} \ \forall n < \omega \ (x \upharpoonright n, y \upharpoonright n) \in R.$$

For given x and y , whether or not $\forall n < \omega \ (x \upharpoonright n, y \upharpoonright n) \in R$ can be checked in time ω . Therefore, $A \in NP_{\omega+1}$. By 0.4, A cannot be in P_{ω_1} , as it is not Borel. $\square$

References

- [1] J.D. Hamkins and A. Lewis, *Infinite time Turing machines*, Journal Symb. Logic **65** (2000), pp. 567 - 604.